

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 19 – 37, 43, 49 and 50, drawn to a method for performing a chemical reaction on the surface of a support, classified in class 506, subclass 30.

II. Claims 38 – 41, drawn to a chemical synthesis apparatus, classified in class 422, subclass 129

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions

10 are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another
11 and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to
12 practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the
13 apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. For
14 example, the chemical synthesis apparatus of invention II, as recited in claim 38, could be used
15 to perform a liquid-phase chemical synthesis process not involving a support surface.

16 Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions
17 listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a
18 serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of
19 the following reasons apply:

20 (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different
21 classification:

- 1 (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized
2 divergent subject matter;
- 3 (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different
4 classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- 5 (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another
6 invention;
- 7 (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101
8 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

9 **Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include**

- 10 **(i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37
11 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

12 The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to
13 petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically
14 point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an
15 election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be
16 considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to
17 petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate
18 which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

19 If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are
20 readable upon the elected invention.

21 Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct,
22 applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the

1 inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either
2 instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence
3 or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4 Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the
5 inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the
6 currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the
7 application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR
8 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

9 The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where
10 applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found
11 allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of
12 the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected
13 process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process
14 invention to be rejoined.

15 In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and
16 the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully
17 examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined
18 claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102,
19 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper
20 restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.
21 Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim
22 will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder

Art Unit: 1797

1 in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be
2 amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so**
3 **may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double
4 patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is
5 withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Any inquiry concerning
6 this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J.
7 Sines whose telephone number is (571) 272-1263. The examiner can normally be reached on
8 Monday - Friday (11 AM - 8 PM EST).

9 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
10 supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the
11 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

12 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
13 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
14 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
15 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
16 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
17 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would
18 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated
19 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

20

Brian J. Sines
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797

21

22 /Brian J. Sines/

1 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797
2